

EDUCATION WEEK

ESEA Renewal: Exploring the Proposals

PROPOSAL: ACCOUNTABILITY



Maintains the NCLB law's testing schedule, and states that have federal waivers could stick with those plans. States that don't already have federal waivers would have to come up with a set of goals that take into account both overall student achievement and growth. States without waivers would have to submit an ambitious accountability plan to the U.S. Secretary of Education for approval.

Senate - D

PROPOSAL: ACCOUNTABILITY



States would essentially get to design their own accountability systems, with few parameters from the federal government. Schools would still have to test students in grades 3-8 and once in high school, and data would have to be disaggregated by subgroups.

Senate - R

PROPOSAL: ACCOUNTABILITY



States would essentially get to design their own accountability systems, with few parameters from the federal government. Schools would still have to test students in grades 3-8 and once in high school, and data would have to be disaggregated by subgroups.

House - R

PROPOSAL: FUNDING



The bill includes a "comparability" requirement, which means that districts would have to ensure that actual teachers' salaries are the same across Title I and non-Title I schools. Now, teachers in a district have to be on the same salary schedule, but the teachers at one school can get paid much more, collectively, than the teachers at another.

Senate - D

PROPOSAL: FUNDING



The bill would get rid of maintenance of effort, which requires districts to keep up their own spending at a certain level in order to tap federal funds. But it would keep in place "supplement not supplant," which prohibits federal dollars from taking the place of local funding.

Senate - R

PROPOSAL: FUNDING



The bill would get rid of maintenance of effort. It would merge programs aimed at migrant students, neglected and delinquent children, English-learners, rural students, and American Indian children into the biggest K-12 program, the Title I program for disadvantaged students. Districts could use the funds for any activity authorized under those programs. No money could be transferred out of Title I schools, but extra funds could go to other low-income schools.

House - R

PROPOSAL: LOW-PERFORMING SCHOOLS



The bill would keep in place the four improvement models created under the Obama administration's School Improvement Grant program. But it would add another option, "whole-school reform," which allows for using turnaround programs with a strong evidence base. And the bill would give slight flexibility to rural districts to change one aspect of whatever model they end up choosing. States could also come up with their own improvement models and submit them to the education secretary for approval. Schools that fail to make progress after an extended period would have to consider more dramatic interventions.

Senate - D

PROPOSAL: LOW-PERFORMING SCHOOLS



The bill would get rid of the School Improvement Grant program and would instead allow states and districts to intervene in the schools they choose.

Senate - R

PROPOSAL: LOW-PERFORMING SCHOOLS



The bill would get rid of the School Improvement Grant program and would instead allow states and districts to intervene in the schools they choose.

House - R

PROPOSAL: STANDARDS



States would have to adopt standards that prepare students for post-secondary education and the workforce, but those standards would not necessarily have to be the same as the Common Core State Standards.

Senate - D

PROPOSAL: STANDARDS



The bill calls for "challenging" standards that will prepare students for postsecondary education without remediation, or for the workforce. It would explicitly bar the secretary of education from doing anything to encourage states to adopt a particular set of standards.

Senate - R

PROPOSAL: STANDARDS



The bill would explicitly bar the secretary of education from doing anything to encourage states to adopt a particular set of standards.

House - R

PROPOSAL: TEACHERS



The bill would encourage states and districts to use Title II dollars to create teacher-evaluation systems based in part on student outcomes, but it wouldn't be a requirement.

Senate - R

PROPOSAL: TEACHERS



In order to tap Title II dollars, districts and states would have to do teacher evaluations based in part on student outcomes, including achievement and growth. Other measures, such as educator observations, would also have to factor in. Districts and states would use this information to help teachers improve their practice and to ensure that good teachers are distributed throughout the district—but not necessarily for big personnel decisions, like salaries and firing.

Senate - D

PROPOSAL: TEACHERS



The bill would allow school districts and/or states to craft teacher-evaluation systems based in part on student outcomes and use them in personnel decisions as defined by the district, including promotions and firing. But such evaluations would not be a requirement.

House - R

PROPOSAL: SCHOOL CHOICE



The bill would no longer require school districts to set aside funding for school choice and tutoring services.

Senate - D

PROPOSAL: SCHOOL CHOICE



The bill would allow Title I dollars to follow students to the school of their choice. And it would require states to set aside 3 percent of Title I dollars to offer competitive grants to districts that want to provide choice and free tutoring to students.

House - R

PROPOSAL: PROGRAMS



The bill would eliminate more than 70 programs, including the Obama administration's signature competitive grant programs, such as Race to the Top, Investing in Innovation, and Promise Neighborhoods.

House - R

PROPOSAL: PROGRAMS



The bill consolidates a wide range of programs into broader funding streams, but also includes new authorizations, including for the Obama administration's signature competitive grant programs, such as Race to the Top, Investing in Promise Neighborhoods.

Senate

Education & Local Gov't Committee
September 23, 2013

Exhibit 17